<u>**REMARKS**</u>

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10, 20, and 21 have been amended as shown at pages 2-6 of the Reply. In addition, claim 26 has been cancelled.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Rayyan for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on June 24, 2008. Examiner was contacted to discuss the claim objection and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). During the interview a set of proposed amendments were agreed upon that addressed the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 identified in the Office Action. These amendments have been incorporated into the claims as shown above. Applicants' representative provided clarification regarding the distinctions of claim 1 and the distinctions of claim amendments to the other independent claims over the cited art. Examiner indicated the she understood the explanations provided, but that further search and consideration was required to determine if the claims would be allowed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   <u>Rejection of Claims 1-9, 20-27 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §101</u>

Claims 1-9, 20-27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims, 1, 10, 20 and 21 have been amended to address this rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II.   <u>Rejection of Claims 1-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)</u>

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravets *et al.* (US 6,363,377) view of Gottsman *et al.* (US 6,134,548) in view of Brown *et al.* (US 6,405,192). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.*, alone of in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

> A factfinder should be aware, of course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of arguments reliant upon *ex post* reasoning. See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) citing Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U. S. 1, 36 (warning against a "temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention in issue" and instructing courts to "'guard against slipping into the use of hindsight'" (*quoting Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co.*, 332 F. 2d 406, 412 (CA6 1964))).

The subject invention relates to enhancing the results of a query by employing user defined preferences against the query results. For example, query results can be examined semantically to identify user interests and a thumbnail summary can be generated. In another example, links within a query result can be examined for content type, such as text, images, and links. A percentage of content type as compared to the total of all content in the linked document can be conveyed to the user. The user can then employ this information to determine if following the link will provide value. A user looking for Picasso paintings may be inclined to follow a link that contains a high percentage of image content. Independent claim 1 recites *user-dependent query result information including an indication of percentage of a content type as compared to total content within at least one linked document in the query result*.

As conceded in the Office Action, Kravets *et al.* (US 6,363,377) and Gottsman *et al.* fail to teach o suggest performing any analysis of links within the query results. Brown *et al.* is cited to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kravets *et al.* and Gottsman *et al.* However, contrary to assertions in the Office Action, the cited reference fails to provide any indication of percentage of the quantity of a single content type as *compared to a total of all content* in the linked document. Brown *et al.* discloses a query system that employs link analysis to identify query terms in linked documents that are of interest to a user. The section of prior art cited discloses an indicator providing a percentage of broken links compared to good links. The percentage is used as an indication of how dated a document has become. This does not provide an indication of percentage of links as compared to the total *of all* content within a linked document. The subject claims' teaching of a percentage indication of a particular content type as compared to the total of all content in the document provides the user with useful information regarding the quantity of types of content in the document. For example, if a web page document has a high percentage of content that is links as compared to the total content in the

document, it can be indicative of a web page that is merely advertising. This percentage indication is clearly distinct from the ratio of broken links to good links provided in Brown *et al.* There is no suggestion or teaching within Brown *et al.* of a percentage providing a comparison of a particular content type, for example image, text, or links, against the total *of all* content of a linked document. The percentage indication provided in the subject claim can provide a quick way for a user to determine the type of content in a linked document. The cited references do not teach or suggest *user-dependent query result information including an indication of percentage of a content type as compared to total content within at least one linked document in the query result* as recited in the subject claim.

Independent claim 10 recites *providing user-dependent query result information derived from the query result; the user-dependent query result information determined via client-side processing, the user-dependent query result information including a list of names of at least one of people or companies extracted from the at least one search result, each name includes one or more links to documents related to the person or company associated with the name*. The subject claim discloses extracting names of people and companies from a search result and providing a list of the names along with links to documents related to the people or companies represented by the names. This allows a user to easily obtain additional information on the people of companies by selecting a link. Kravets *et al.* discloses a system for organizing search results in search queries and results into related clusters and provides a tool for tuning a query to be more narrow or broader. Gottsman, *et al.* discloses a system for searching through shopping sites in order to compare products and locate bargains. Brown, *et al.* discloses a system for parsing search results based upon user specified criteria. The cited references fails to teach extracting names and providing related links in a list and thus fails to disclose all elements of the subject claim.

Independent claim 20 recites *means for partitioning the query result into a plurality of subparts, scoring each subpart for relevance based upon a user context, highlighting the subpart that has the highest score, automatically scrolling to the highlighted subpart, providing the automatically scrolled and highlighted user-dependent query result information derived from the query result*. The subject claim discloses partitioning a search result document into subparts and scoring each subpart so that the subpart with the highest score can be highlighted and automatically scroll to the subpart. The cited references fail to teach partitioning

the document into subparts and scoring each subpart, and also do not teach automatically scrolling to the highest scoring subpart of the document. Therefore, Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.* fail to teach all limitations of the subject claim.

Moreover, independent claim 21 recites *at least one output presented on a display device to indicate user-dependent search query result information; the output utilizing, at least in part, a thumbnail view to convey the information, **the thumbnail view includes highlighting of relevant content in the at least one search query result, the relevance based upon a current context of the user, the current user context is inferred based upon automated monitoring of actions relating to a task that the user is currently performing.*** Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.* are silent regarding determining relevance based upon inferring a current context of a user by monitoring their actions related to a current task they are performing. Therefore, Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.* fail to teach all elements of the subject claim.

In view of at least the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 20, and 21 (and claims 2-9, 11-19, 22-25, and 27-29 that respectfully depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP559US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731